

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Quintin M. Littlejohn,) C/A No. 7:07-255-RBH
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) **O R D E R**
)
International Court of Justice, The Peace)
Palace,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, has brought suit against the International Court of Justice and the Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands. Petitioner filed his complaint on January 25, 2007.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 this matter comes before the Court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate William M. Catoe filed February 1, 2007. Based on his review of the record, the Magistrate Judge concluded that the case be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required

to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The district court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings and recommendations. Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47-48 (4th Cir. 1982) (failure to file specific objections to particular conclusions in Magistrate Judge's Report, after warning of consequences of failure to object, waives further review). Without specific objection to the Magistrate Judge's reasoning , it is not necessary for this court to discuss the conclusion reached by the Magistrate Judge any further. See 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C) (If a party objects, the district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or *specified* proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made") (emphasis added).

On February 7, 2007, the petitioner filed a document entitled "Letter of Request". He filed another document on February 14, 2007. The Court finds that these filings by the plaintiff do not constitute proper objections to the Report and Recommendation. His documents fail to adequately direct the court's attention to a specific error in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner's filing does not satisfy the specificity requirement of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.¹

¹Rule 72(b) states:

Within ten days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file **specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.** . . . The district judge to whom the case is assigned shall make a de novo determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of **any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule.**

After carefully reviewing the Report, documents filed by the plaintiff, pleadings, and applicable law, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, incorporates it herein, and overrules the petitioner's objection. Therefore, the complaint is **DISMISSED** *without prejudice* and without issuance or service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/R. Bryan Harwell

R. Bryan Harwell

United States District Judge

Florence, S.C.

February 20, 2007

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) (emphasis added).